


Plaintiffs filed objections (Doc. No. 132) to the Report and Recommendation and Defendant filed a Response (Doc. No. 133). Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Rule 72.02, a district court reviews *de novo* any portion of a report and recommendation to which a specific objection is made. *United States v. Curtis*, 237 F.3d 598, 603 (6th Cir. 2001). General or conclusory objections are insufficient. *See Zimmerman v. Cason*, 354 F. Appx. 228, 230 (6th Cir. 2009). Thus, “only those specific objections to the magistrate’s report made to the district court will be preserved for appellate review.” *Id.* (quoting *Smith v. Detroit Fed’n of Teachers*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987)). In conducting the review, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Plaintiffs' objections (Doc. No. 132) do not directly challenge the reasoning of the Report and Recommendation or lodge specific objections to the Report and Recommendation. Instead, Plaintiffs appear to simply re-state facts and arguments they previously made, (*see* Plaintiffs' Motion to Recuse, Doc. No. 85; Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to Take Deposition of Defendant Fresenius Medical Care Holdings, Inc. Out of Time, Doc. No. 90), and the Court already considered in prior rulings. (*See* Order denying Plaintiffs' Motion to Recuse, Doc. No. 93; Order denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to Take Deposition, Doc. No. 94; Order affirming Magistrate Judge's Order denying Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to Take Deposition, Doc. No. 110). Thus, Plaintiffs' objections do not provide a basis to reject or modify the Report and Recommendation. *See Howard v. Sec. of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 509 (6th Cir. 1991); *VanDiver v. Martin*, 304 F. Supp. 2d 934, 937 (E.D. Mich. 2004) ("An 'objection' that does nothing more than state a disagreement with a magistrate's suggested resolution, or simply summarizes what has been presented before, is not an 'objection' as that term is used in this context.").

For the reasons described above, Plaintiffs' objections fail to state viable grounds to challenge the Magistrate Judge's conclusions, nor do they otherwise provide a basis to reject or modify the Report and Recommendation. Thus, having reviewed the Report and Recommendation and fully considered Plaintiffs' objections, the Court concludes Plaintiffs' objections are without merit, and that the Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 131) should be adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendant's motions for summary judgment (Doc. Nos. 96, 98, 100) are **GRANTED**, and this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.

This Order shall constitute the final judgment in this case pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

It is so **ORDERED**.


WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE